

get it...until you put it into play. We have been honest and forthright in coming forward, when we see these problems we bring forward proposals to change them. The easiest way to change the one that we solved was to use another bill that was there on Select File. Select File bills were up. Final Reading bills weren't up. I hope that Senator Hannibal wasn't implying that there is some skullduggery going on here. Gosh, if we...any time somebody used another vehicle to carry an amendment that was out of bounds, a big proportion of our legislation passed each year wouldn't count for some reason or another. I just indicate that the concerns that Senator Hannibal raised about LB 1059, I think, are unfounded. Sure, there are some problems with any time you make a change. We will be back. We were back on choice last year. That's what LB 843 is. We went ahead and passed it last year and we worked to clean it up. There will be clean-up on any major piece of legislation. That's all we are doing with the amendments and somewhat resent, I guess, the implication that there is some skullduggery going on here because there certainly isn't. With that, I would like to give the rest of my time to Senator Baack who I think can shed a little more light on the questions.

PRESIDENT: Senator Baack, two and a half minutes.

SENATOR BAACK: Yes, Mr. President and colleagues, what Senator Hannibal brings up is legitimate. I mean, we are...we did put an amendment on LB 843 dealing with the problem of LB 1059 and I mentioned that on the floor yesterday. We didn't try and hide that. I mentioned on the floor yesterday that we were dealing with the final distribu...with the final payment for distribution of state aid. That's what we were dealing with because there was a repealer in the original 1059 that caused some problems there. They are not problems that are insurmountable. If LB 843 should not happen to pass, I would...I would guess that either the courts would probably have to rule in this case as to whether or not that payment could be made. There is no doubt in my mind that the courts would rule that that payment could be made because the things were in place to do that. It's just that we inadvertently put that in there, a wrong date that repealed something too early. That was the only problem there. The courts would have definitely done that. All that...all that this does is it makes it a lot cleaner way of dealing with this issue and that's all that we were trying to do. There was no...there was nothing that we were trying to hide in this. I mentioned on the floor yesterday this is